

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

I. Specification Amendment

Applicant has amended a number of paragraphs in the specification to correct a number of previously undetected informalities, as well as to clarify certain portions of the specification. While Applicant found the specification understandable prior to amendment, Applicant made the amendments in order to further clarify the specification in light of the Examiner's comments, and to expedite prosecution. These amendments are not being entered to overcome prior art. No prior art has been presented at this point in the prosecution of this application, and, as such, there is no prior art to even arguably overcome. No new matter has been introduced.

II. Disclosure Objection

In the subject Office Action, the disclosure was objected to under 37 CFR 1.71 as not being comprehensible enough to conduct a reasonable search of the prior art by the Examiner. While Applicant disagrees with such a statement, as noted above, Applicant has made certain amendments to correct previously undetected informalities as well as to clarify certain portions of the disclosure. The Examiner specifically cited the paragraph on page 4, lines 12-16, as not comprehensibly describing which strobe signals are applied for the differential versus the single-ended modes. Clarifying amendments have been made to this paragraph to directly address the Examiner's concerns, and include the following statement: "That is, strobe signal P 20 is provided to Enabling Pulse Clock Generator 24 for the differential signaling mode, and strobe signal N 22 is provided to Enabling Pulse Clock Generator 24 for the single-ended signaling mode." The above statement is a restatement of the sentence immediately preceding it, and describes what is illustrated in Figure 1.

III. Claim Amendment

In objecting to the disclosure, the Examiner also specifically stated the "last paragraphs of claims 4 and 6, claims 7-9 cannot be understood because of the non-

grammatical language.” In response, Applicant has made certain nonsubstantive amendments to the claims, solely for the purpose of clarifying the claims. These amendments are not being entered to overcome prior art. No prior art has been presented at this point in the prosecution of this application, and, as such, there is no prior art to even arguably overcome. No new matter has been introduced.

An amendment to claim 6 was made restating a portion of the “generating” element of the claim so that the “generating” element is more clearly based on claim 6’s preceding “selecting” element. That is, the deleted portion of the “generating” element of claim 6 has been restated by the new portion of the “generating” element of claim 6. All other amendments to the claims can be characterized as nothing more than correcting typographical errors or making formatting adjustments, namely adding a missing “s” to various words in claims 4 and 6, changing “the” to “a” to correct a potential antecedent basis issue in claim 9, removing a redundant comma in claim 9, and making clarifying indentation adjustments in claims 6 and 9. After much consideration, Applicant can discern no further grammatical problems with the claims. Applicant has in good faith done everything possible to address the Examiner’s objection, and believes the Examiner will find the disclosure clear.

The only additional comment Applicant can make regarding the claims deals with claim 8, where the “both times” in “selecting the third strobe signal, both times” refers to the two sub-elements of the selecting operation of claim 6, namely (1) “one of the first and the third strobe signals,” and (2) “one of the second and the third strobe signals.” Applicant finds this language clear, as there are two sub-elements of the selecting operation of claim 6, and both are being referred to by the cited language of claim 8.

If the Examiner still has concerns after considering the disclosure in light of the amendments, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicant’s representative, undersigned below, at (503) 796-2904 to discuss those concerns, as Applicant submits the disclosure is clear and understandable.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits all pending claims, that is, claims 1-20, are in condition of allowance. Early issuance of the Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge shortages or credit overpayments to Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Dated: 8/10/05

Pierre Keeley
Pierre Keeley
Reg. No. 57,045

Pacwest Center, Suite 1900
1211 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: 503-222-9981